arXiv:1107.4646v2 [quant-ph] 12 Oct 2011

No-go theorem for photon bunching suppression via all-unitary linear optics

Lian-Ao Wu,[1] Philip Walther,[2] and Daniel Lidar[3]

[1]*Ikerbasque–Basque Foundation for Science and Department of Theoretical Physics and History of Science,*
The Basque Country University (EHU/UPV), PO Box 644, 48080 Bilbao, Spain
[2]*Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ), Faculty of Physics,*
University of Vienna, Boltzmanngasse 5, Vienna A-1090, Austria
[3]*Departments of Electrical Engineering, Chemistry, and Physics*
Center for Quantum Information & Technology
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089, USA

(Dated: October 14, 2011)

We prove that linear optical elements such as phase shifters and beam splitters alone, cannot be used to simultaneously generate arbitrary single-qubit gates on a pair of qubits realized as single-photon optical modes, and at the same time prevent coupling to the subspace of states of two photons per mode. This constitutes a no-go theorem for photon bunching suppression via all-unitary linear optics.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 42.50.Ex, 42.25.Hz

Introduction.—Optical implementations of qubits have played an important role in quantum information science. Photons have an intrinsic lack of decoherence and are simple to control by standard off-the-shelf components. Furthermore, photonic qubits for quantum computation are particularly attractive because they can be used to interface to various quantum communication applications [1]. Due to the extremely small photon-photon coupling available in existing materials, it was at one point believed that optical qubits could not be used for scalable quantum computation. However, it is now understood that the process of photon detection itself can lead to effective photon-photon nonlinearities. In particular Knill, Laflamme, and Milburne (KLM) [2] launched the field of linear optics quantum computing (LOQC) by showing that deterministic single-photon sources and high-efficiency single-photon detectors allow the realization of scalable, probabilistic quantum computation purely with linear optical elements. This holds in spite of the fact that using linear optics alone, the success probability of the nonlinear sign shift gate used in the KLM scheme cannot be improved above $1/4$ [3, 4]. Since the original KLM proposal, a number of authors have suggested various simplifications, modifications, and optimizations, e.g., [5–8]. Although these results formally show that scalable quantum computing is possible, the realization is very demanding in practice due to the large resource overhead arising from the required non-deterministic photon detection events. This becomes particularly apparent when considering beamsplitter-based two-photon gates, which are probabilistic in nature. In fact all optical two-qubit gates [9], including the promising non-destructive CNOT gate [10, 11], fail in the case where more than one photon is emitted into the same optical output mode, due to photon bunching. One proposal to suppress such gate failure events in the polarization encoding uses the quantum Zeno effect, by coupling to the output light fields to atomic transitions [12, 13].

Here we address the natural question of whether linear optical elements alone can be used to establish quantum interference such that the photon-bunching effect, and thus the probability of gate failure, can be suppressed. We show that this cannot be achieved in either the single-rail or dual-rail encoding paradigms, in the sense that one cannot simultaneously implement a linear optical two-photon entangling gate and decouple the double-occupancy states [14]. We thus prove a no-go theorem for photon bunching suppression via all-unitary linear optics [15].

Linear optical elements.—In the standard circuit model of quantum computing any unitary transformation on n qubits can be decomposed as a product of gates, each of which acts nontrivially on at most two qubits, and is the identity on the other qubits [16]. Likewise, in the linear optics model, any unitary transformation on m modes can be decomposed into a product of "linear optical elements," each of which acts nontrivially on at most two modes, and is the identity on the other $m-2$ modes [17]. As linear optical operations we consider just phase shifters and beam splitters as they generate all linear optical elements [i.e., all 2×2 unitaries, the group $\mathrm{U}(2)$] when acting on the same pair of modes. Moreover, when they are allowed to act on overlapping pairs of modes, the linear optical elements generate all $m \times m$ unitaries [i.e., the group $\mathrm{U}(m)$] [18].

Single vs. dual-rail encoding.— Single photon optical qubits come primarily in two varieties: single-rail [19, 20], where a qubit is represented by the absence or presence of a single photon of fixed polarization in one optical mode, and dual-rail [16], where each qubit is encoded into the presence of a single photon in one or the other of two spatial optical modes. Polarization qubits [21]—where each qubit is represented by two orthogonal polarization modes—are formally equivalent to dual-rail qubits [9], so we will use both interchangeably. Most LOQC proposals, including the original KLM scheme, use dual-rail qubits, but there is considerable interest in the single-rail encoding scheme as well, as evidenced by the numerous experiments devoted to preparation of arbitrary single-rail qubits, e.g., [22–26]. In the dual-rail encoding single-qubit operations are straightforward while non-trivial two-qubits are challenging and are implemented probabilistically [2]. The reverse is true for single-rail encoding: non-trivial two qubit gates are straightforward, while single-qubits can be implemented probabilistically [27]. In both the single and dual-rail encodings two-qubit gate failure due to photon bunching is a major challenge standing in the way of scalability.

The subspace of interest in the single-rail encoding is spanned by the 6-dimensional Fock state basis $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ where

$$\mathcal{A} \equiv \{1, a_1^\dagger, a_2^\dagger, a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger\}|\mathbf{0}\rangle, \tag{1}$$

$$\mathcal{B} \equiv \{a_1^{\dagger 2}, a_2^{\dagger 2}\}|\mathbf{0}\rangle/\sqrt{2}. \tag{2}$$

Here $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ is the global vacuum, $a_i^\dagger$, a_i, and n_i are the creation, annihilation, and number operator for mode i, respectively, satisfying the bosonic commutation relations $[a_i, a_j^\dagger] = \delta_{ij}$, $[a_i, n_i] = a_i$, and $[a_i^\dagger, n_i] = -a_i^\dagger$. The subspace $\mathcal{A}$ is the computational basis of single-photon states in each of the two modes, while $\mathcal{B}$ is the subspace of two photon states in either one of the two modes (double-occupation states). The latter are the problematic states causing computational errors in the single-rail encoding. To define a basis for the polarization encoding consider the creation operators $a_{ip}^\dagger$, where $i \in \{1, 2\}$ is the spatial mode index, $p \in \{H, V\}$ is the polarization mode index, and all $a_{ip}^\dagger$ commute for all values of i and p. The ith qubit basis states are then $|0\rangle_i = a_{iH}^\dagger|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|1\rangle_i = a_{iV}^\dagger|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, so that the computational and double-occupation (error) subspaces are, respectively,

$$\mathcal{A}' \equiv \{a_{1H}^\dagger a_{2H}^\dagger, a_{1H}^\dagger a_{2V}^\dagger, a_{1V}^\dagger a_{2H}^\dagger, a_{1V}^\dagger a_{2V}^\dagger\}|\mathbf{0}\rangle, \tag{3}$$

$$\mathcal{B}' \equiv \{a_{iH}^{\dagger 2}/\sqrt{2}, a_{iV}^{\dagger 2}/\sqrt{2}, a_{iH}^\dagger a_{iV}^\dagger\}|\mathbf{0}\rangle, \quad i \in \{1, 2\} \tag{4}$$

It is well known that linear optics is insufficient for generating non-trivial (entangling) two-qubit gates in the dual-rail encoding. Indeed, this, together with the inherent weakness of non-linear photonic interactions such as the Kerr effect, is the *raison d'être* of the KLM scheme. The reason is a straightforward group-theoretic counting argument. Consider $m = 2K$ optical modes. If dual-rail linear optics could generate an entangling gate between one pair of qubits, which could then be swapped to all other pairs of qubits using beam splitters, the set of linear optical elements would generate the group U(2^K). However, this contradicts the fact that the set of linear optical elements can only generate U($2K$) [18, 28]. This means that it is impossible to generate an entangling gate in the subspace $\mathcal{A}'$, irrespective of what happens in $\mathcal{B}'$. However, this argument cannot be applied in the single-rail case, so we devote the remainder of this work to the no-go theorem for the single-rail case.

No-go theorem for two modes.—The Hermitian beam-splitter generator is

$$X \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(a_2^\dagger a_1 + a_1^\dagger a_2\right), \tag{5}$$

and the Hermitian phase shifter generators are, for each mode,

$$n_1 = a_1^\dagger a_1, \quad n_2 = a_2^\dagger a_2. \tag{6}$$

Let us also define

$$Y \equiv \frac{i}{2}\left(a_2^\dagger a_1 - a_1^\dagger a_2\right), \qquad Z \equiv \frac{1}{2}(n_1 - n_2). \tag{7}$$

Then it is easily checked using the identities in [29] that the set of Hermitian operators $\{X, Y, Z\}$ is closed under commutation and moreover satisfies su(2) commutation relations. Therefore the beam-splitter generator X and the phase shifter generators (combined as Z) generate U(2). The most general unitary evolution operator we can then construct according to the Euler decomposition is the following composite gate:

$$U(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon) = e^{i(\alpha n_1 + \beta n_2)} e^{i\epsilon X} e^{i(\gamma n_1 + i\delta n_2)}, \tag{8}$$

where we have allowed a more general linear combination of the two phase shifter generators than Z, since they can be independently tuned.

We are interested in the (reducible) representation of the unitary operator (8) in the 6-dimensional Fock state basis $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. We shall now show that if one demands that U does not couple $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, then without further assumptions it is not possible to implement an entangling gate between the two single-rail qubits. In the $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ basis we have

$$\begin{aligned} &U(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon) = \\ &\mathrm{diag}(1, e^{i\alpha}, e^{i\beta}, e^{i(\alpha+\beta)}, e^{2i\alpha}, e^{2i\beta}) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \\ & A_1 & \\ & & B_1 \end{bmatrix} \times \\ &\mathrm{diag}(1, e^{i\gamma}, e^{i\delta}, e^{i(\gamma+\delta)}, e^{2i\gamma}, e^{2i\delta}) \\ &\quad = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \\ & A_2 & \\ & & B_2 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where diag denotes a diagonal matrix and where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos\epsilon & i\sin\epsilon \\ i\sin\epsilon & \cos\epsilon \end{bmatrix}, \\ A_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} e^{i(\alpha+\gamma)}\cos\epsilon & ie^{i(\alpha+\delta)}\sin\epsilon \\ ie^{i(\beta+\gamma)}\sin\epsilon & e^{i(\beta+\delta)}\cos\epsilon \end{bmatrix}, \\ B_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos 2\epsilon & \frac{1}{i\sqrt{2}}\sin 2\epsilon & \frac{1}{i\sqrt{2}}\sin 2\epsilon \\ \frac{1}{i\sqrt{2}}\sin 2\epsilon & \cos^2\epsilon & -\sin^2\epsilon \\ \frac{1}{i\sqrt{2}}\sin 2\epsilon & -\sin^2\epsilon & \cos^2\epsilon \end{bmatrix}, \\ B_2 &= \\ &\begin{bmatrix} e^{i(\alpha+\beta+\gamma+\delta)}\cos 2\epsilon & e^{i(\alpha+\beta+2\gamma)}\frac{\sin 2\epsilon}{i\sqrt{2}} & e^{i(\alpha+\beta+2\delta)}\frac{\sin 2\epsilon}{i\sqrt{2}} \\ e^{i(2\alpha+\gamma+\delta)}\frac{\sin 2\epsilon}{i\sqrt{2}} & e^{2i(\alpha+\gamma)}\cos^2\epsilon & -e^{2i(\alpha+\delta)}\sin^2\epsilon \\ e^{i(2\beta+\gamma+\delta)}\frac{\sin 2\epsilon}{i\sqrt{2}} & -e^{2i(\beta+\gamma)}\sin^2\epsilon & e^{2i(\beta+\delta)}\cos^2\epsilon \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Note that $U(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon)$ consists of three blocks (1, A_2, and B_2) of dimensions 1 (vacuum), 2 (one photon), and 3 (two photons), respectively. Therefore repeated applications of the composite gate U with different values for the angles $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon$ will still have the same triple block structure.

Hence our construction is general in the sense that we need only consider a single composite gate U.

Now, the problem is that the two-photon block includes $\mathcal{B}$. We would like to decouple these two states from the other four. Clearly, this can be done by setting the matrix elements $U_{4,5}, U_{4,6}, U_{5,4}$ and $U_{6,4}$ (i.e., the $(1,2), (1,3), (2,1), (3,1)$ elements of B_2) to zero. As is clear from Eq. (10), a necessary and sufficient condition for this is

$$\sin 2\epsilon = 0. \tag{11}$$

This is achieved whenever ϵ is an integer multiple of $\pi/2$. If we pick an even multiple $2n$ of $\pi/2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} U(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta,n\pi) = \mathrm{diag}(1, (-1)^n e^{i(\alpha+\gamma)}, (-1)^n e^{i(\beta+\delta)}, \\ e^{i(\alpha+\beta+\gamma+\delta)}, e^{2i(\alpha+\gamma)}, e^{2i(\beta+\delta)}) \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

If we pick an odd multiple $2n+1$ of $\pi/2$ we have

$$U(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta,(2n+1)\frac{\pi}{2}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \\ & A_3 & \\ & & B_3 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

where

$$A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (-1)^n i e^{i(\alpha+\delta)} \\ (-1)^n i e^{i(\beta+\gamma)} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B_3 = \begin{bmatrix} -e^{i(\alpha+\beta+\gamma+\delta)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -e^{2i(\alpha+\delta)} \\ 0 & -e^{2i(\beta+\gamma)} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

In both cases U has a block-diagonal structure where the two-photons per mode states are decoupled from the other four states. Considering just the 4-dimensional block acting on $\mathrm{span}(\mathcal{A})$, we have for the even case

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{diag}(1, (-1)^n e^{i(\alpha+\gamma)}, (-1)^n e^{i(\beta+\delta)}, e^{i(\alpha+\beta+\gamma+\delta)}) = \\ \mathrm{diag}(1, (-1)^n e^{i(\beta+\delta)}) \otimes \mathrm{diag}(1, (-1)^n e^{i(\alpha+\gamma)}) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

i.e., a tensor product of two single-qubit phase gates. Similarly, for the odd case we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (-1)^n i e^{i(\alpha+\delta)} & 0 \\ 0 & (-1)^n i e^{i(\beta+\gamma)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -e^{i(\alpha+\beta+\gamma+\delta)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathrm{SWAP}\, \mathrm{diag}(1, (-1)^n i e^{i(\alpha+\delta)}) \otimes \mathrm{diag}(1, (-1)^n i e^{i(\beta+\gamma)}), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where SWAP $= \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, a non-entangling gate. Unfortunately this means that, having decoupled $\mathrm{span}(\mathcal{B})$, the action of U on the $\mathcal{A}$ subspace is equivalent to a tensor product of two single-qubit phase gates, and therefore is no longer entangling.

The reason for this no-go result is straightforward: we are forced to set ϵ equal to a multiple of $\pi/2$ in order to prevent coupling to the $\mathrm{span}(\mathcal{B})$ subspace. Once we do this we are left with only four independent parameters $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)$, which are the parameters of the two phase shifters [see Eq. (8)]. The latter can only generate phase gates. To circumvent this result would require the use of some type of nonlinear optical element.

No-go theorem for $M > 2$ modes.—One might wonder whether the inclusion of additional modes allows to circumvent the no-go theorem. We next show that this is not the case. Consider a linear optical system with M modes containing a total of two photons, of which only the first two modes–supporting two qubits–are the target of linear optical quantum computation [30]. We shall therefore refer to these two modes as the "computational modes." With up to two photons per mode these comprise the computational basis $\mathcal{A}$ (1) and the undesired double-occupation states $\mathcal{B}$ (2). The other $M-2$ ancillary modes are used to try to remove the $\mathrm{span}(\mathcal{B})$ subspace of the computational modes. The relevant basis states are therefore $\mathcal{A}\cup\mathcal{B}$ for modes $j=1$ and 2, and the set of Fock states

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \prod_{j=3}^{M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_j!}} (a_j^\dagger)^{n_j} |\mathbf{0}\rangle \right\}, \tag{16}$$

for modes $j = 3,\ldots,M$, where each occupation number $n_j \in \{0,1,2\}\ \forall j \in \{1,\ldots,M\}$, and $\sum_{j=1}^{M} n_j \leq 2$. The complete 2-photon Hilbert space is then $\mathcal{H} = \mathrm{span}[(\mathcal{A}\cup\mathcal{B})\otimes\mathcal{C}]$.

Now let V be some arbitrary linear unitary optical transformation on all, or some subset, of the M modes. For example, V could be a product of phase shifters and beam splitters coupling any pair of modes. By linearity, V has the following matrix representation:

$$V a_i^\dagger V^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^{M} v_{ij} a_j^\dagger, \quad i \in \{1,\ldots,M\}. \tag{17}$$

Note that this matrix representation is in the basis of bosonic creation operators, which differs from the Fock state basis spanning $\mathcal{H}$. We need both of these representations for our proof. Whatever V is, we require that after it is applied the computational Fock state basis states $\mathcal{A}$ are decoupled from the rest. In other words, while V may be constructed from linear optical elements which couple different states, including the computational basis and all other states, at the end there may be no transitions between the computational subspace $\mathrm{span}(\mathcal{A})$ to the rest of the Fock space $\mathcal{H}' \equiv \mathcal{H} \smallsetminus \mathrm{span}(\mathcal{A})$. Formally, this means that we require that for all computational basis states $|\psi_\alpha\rangle \in \mathcal{A}$ and for all other basis states $|\varphi_\beta\rangle \in \mathcal{H}'$,

$$\langle\psi_\alpha| V |\varphi_\beta\rangle = 0. \tag{18}$$

This requirement states that V has a block-diagonal structure in the Fock state basis: $V = V_{\mathcal{A}} \oplus V_{\mathcal{H}'}$, where $V_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a 4×4 matrix that is supposed to implement an entangling operation inside the computational basis, and $V_{\mathcal{H}'}$ is some

$\dim\mathcal{H}'\times\dim\mathcal{H}'$ linear optical matrix. We shall now show that by combining this Fock space requirement with the linearity of V (as expressed in the basis of creation operators), the problem reduces to the one we already studied in the two-mode case, namely, $V_{\mathcal{H}'} = V_{\mathcal{B}}\oplus V_{\mathcal{H}''}$, where $V_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a 2×2 matrix acting exclusively on the $\mathcal{B}$ states, and $V_{\mathcal{H}''}$ is some linear optical matrix acting in the $\mathcal{H}'\smallsetminus\operatorname{span}(B)$ subspace. Because of this block-diagonal structure of V, in particular $V_{\mathcal{A}}\oplus V_{\mathcal{B}}$, the conclusion from the $M=2$ analysis, that $V_{\mathcal{A}}$ is non-entangling, will apply directly, i.e., $V_{\mathcal{A}}$ will have to be in the form of either Eq. (14) or Eq. (15).

To prove this, consider the matrix element of V between a single-photon computational basis state $a_1^\dagger|0\rangle$ and a single-photon state in some mode $j\in\{3,\ldots,M\}$, which must vanish by our no-leakage requirement (18):

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = \langle\mathbf{0}|a_jVa_1^\dagger|\mathbf{0}\rangle &= \langle\mathbf{0}|a_jVa_1^\dagger V^\dagger V|\mathbf{0}\rangle && \text{(19a)}\\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{M} v_{1k}\langle\mathbf{0}|a_ja_k^\dagger V|\mathbf{0}\rangle && \text{(19b)}\\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{2} v_{1k}\langle\mathbf{0}|a_k^\dagger a_jV|\mathbf{0}\rangle + \sum_{k=3}^{M} v_{1k}\langle\mathbf{0}|\left(a_k^\dagger a_j+\delta_{jk}\right)V|\mathbf{0}\rangle && \text{(19c)}\\
&= v_{1j}\langle\mathbf{0}|V|\mathbf{0}\rangle;\quad j\in\{3,\ldots,M\}, && \text{(19d)}
\end{aligned}$$

where to arrive at (19b) we used the linearity condition Eq. (17), to arrive at (19c) we used the commutation relation $[a_j,a_k^\dagger]=\delta_{jk}$, and to arrive at the last line we used $\langle\mathbf{0}|a_k^\dagger=0$. Now, because V is a product of linear optical elements, and each such element can be written as $\exp(-i\Omega)$, where Ω is linear combination of X, Y and Z [Eqs. (5) and (7), with the appropriate mode index adjustment], we have $\Omega|\mathbf{0}\rangle=0$, so that $V|\mathbf{0}\rangle=|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, and hence $\langle\mathbf{0}|V|\mathbf{0}\rangle=1$. We can thus conclude that $v_{1j}=0$. A similar calculation leads to $v_{j1}=v_{2j}=v_{j2}=0$. These constraints state that, subject to Eq. (18), V does not couple modes $1,2$ and the ancilla modes, i.e., it has a block-diagonal structure in the creation operator basis.

Next, let us show that this result means that V cannot couple the double-occupation states $\mathcal{B}$ to the ancilla modes, i.e., that $V_{\mathcal{H}'}=V_{\mathcal{B}}\oplus V_{\mathcal{H}''}$. Note first that because V is a linear optical unitary, it commutes with the number operator, i.e., it preserves the mode occupation number, and hence its only non-vanishing matrix elements are between Fock states with equal occupation numbers. For this reason we need only consider matrix elements of V between elements of $\mathcal{B}$ and two-photon states in $\mathcal{C}$, e.g., $\langle\mathbf{0}|a_1^2Va_i^\dagger a_j^\dagger|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, where $i,j\in\{3,\ldots,M\}$ ($i=j$ or $i\neq j$). Let us show that this matrix element also vanishes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\mathbf{0}|a_1^2Va_i^\dagger a_j^\dagger|\mathbf{0}\rangle &= \langle\mathbf{0}|a_1^2Va_i^\dagger V^\dagger Va_j^\dagger V^\dagger V|\mathbf{0}\rangle && \text{(20a)}\\
&= \sum_{k,l=1}^{M} v_{ik}v_{jl}\langle\mathbf{0}|a_1^2a_k^\dagger a_l^\dagger V|\mathbf{0}\rangle && \text{(20b)}\\
&= v_{i1}v_{j1}\langle\mathbf{0}|a_1^2a_1^\dagger a_1^\dagger|\mathbf{0}\rangle + \sum_{k=2}^{M} v_{ik}v_{j1}\langle\mathbf{0}|a_k^\dagger a_1^2a_1^\dagger|\mathbf{0}\rangle\\
&\quad + \sum_{l=2}^{M} v_{i1}v_{jl}\langle\mathbf{0}|a_l^\dagger a_1^2a_1^\dagger|\mathbf{0}\rangle + \sum_{k,l=2}^{M} v_{ik}v_{jl}\langle\mathbf{0}|a_k^\dagger a_l^\dagger a_1^2|\mathbf{0}\rangle && \text{(20c)}\\
&= 0;\quad i,j\in\{3,\ldots,M\} && \text{(20d)}
\end{aligned}$$

where to arrive at (20b) we used Eq. (17) again, to arrive at (20c) we used $V|0\rangle=|0\rangle$ along with the bosonic commutation relation $[a_i,a_j^\dagger]=\delta_{ij}$, and to arrive at (20d) we used the previously derived $v_{1j}=v_{j1}=v_{2j}=v_{j2}=0$ for $j\geq 3$ for the first three terms in (20c) (the second and third terms also vanish due to $\langle\mathbf{0}|a_k^\dagger=\langle\mathbf{0}|a_l^\dagger=0$), and $a_1|\mathbf{0}\rangle=0$ for the last term. A similar calculation shows that $\langle\mathbf{0}|a_2^2Va_i^\dagger a_j^\dagger|\mathbf{0}\rangle=0$ for $i,j\in\{3,\ldots,M\}$. Thus, we have shown that in the Fock state basis, V has the claimed block-diagonal matrix representation, namely $V=V_{\mathcal{A}}\oplus V_{\mathcal{B}}\oplus V_{\mathcal{H}''}$. The $M=2$ result thus applies, and V is equivalent to a product of two single-qubit phase gates inside the computational subspace $\operatorname{span}(A)$. We conclude that there is no advantage to considering a larger number of modes. This result is a consequence of the assumption (17) that V is a unitary linear optical transformation, and the requirement (18) that the computational basis states are decoupled from the rest of the Fock space.

Conclusions.—We have shown that using linear optics alone it is not possible to suppress the photon bunching effect. This means that the probability of a successful gate operation using passive optical elements, such as non-polarizing and polarizing beamsplitters, cannot be improved. This result agrees with previous theoretical work [2, 31] showing that passive linear optics does not involve particle interactions other than those imposed by statistics, and can be understood in terms of classical wave mechanics. Therefore additional nonlinear operations such as photon-detection or absorption [12], the Kerr effect, or light squeezing, are needed in order to enable universal linear optical quantum computing.

L.-A.W. is supported by the Ikerbasque Foundation Start-up, the Basque Government (grant IT472-10) and the Spanish MEC (Project No. FIS2009-12773-C02-02). P.W. acknowledges the support from the European Commission, Q-ESSENCE (No. 248095), JTF, Austrian Science Fund (FWF) (SFB-FOCUS and Y585-N20), and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Air Force Material Command, USAF, under grant number FA8655-11-1-3004. D.A.L. is supported by the National Science Foundation under grant No. PHY-969969.

[1] J. L. O’Brien, A. Furusawa, and J. Vučković, Nature Photonics, **3**, 687 (2009).
[2] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and G. Milburn, Nature, **409**, 46 (2001).
[3] S. Scheel and N. Ltkenhaus, New J. Phys., **6**, 51 (2004).
[4] J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. Lett., **95**, 040502 (2005).
[5] T. B. Pittman, B. C. Jacobs, and J. D. Franson, Phys. Rev. A, **64**, 062311 (2001).
[6] E. Knill, Phys. Rev. A, **66**, 052306 (2002).
[7] T. C. Ralph, A. G. White, W. J. Munro, and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A, **65**, 012314 (2001).
[8] D. B. Uskov, L. Kaplan, A. M. Smith, S. D. Huver, and J. P. Dowling, Phys. Rev. A, **79**, 042326 (2009).
[9] P. Kok, W. J. Munro, K. Nemoto, T. C. Ralph, J. P. Dowling, and G. J. Milburn, Rev. Mod. Phys., **79**, 135 (2007).
[10] T. B. Pittman, B. C. Jacobs, and J. D. Franson, Phys. Rev. Lett., **88**, 257902 (2002).
[11] T. B. Pittman, M. J. Fitch, B. C. Jacobs, and J. D. Franson, Phys. Rev. A, **68**, 032316 (2003).
[12] J. D. Franson, B. C. Jacobs, and T. B. Pittman, Phys. Rev. A, **70**, 062302 (2004).
[13] P. M. Leung and T. C. Ralph, New J. Phys., **9**, 224 (2007).
[14] In this work we are not concerned with single-photon nonlocality [32].
[15] Our result is complementary to the recent proof that the single-photon fraction in any of the single-mode states resulting from purely linear optical processing (even including conditioning on results of detections) cannot be made to exceed the efficiency of the best available photon source [33].
[16] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
[17] S. Aaronson and A. Arkhipov, (2010), 1011.3245.
[18] M. Reck, A. Zeilinger, H. J. Bernstein, and P. Bertani, Phys. Rev. Lett., **73**, 58 (1994).
[19] D. T. Pegg, L. S. Phillips, and S. M. Barnett, Phys. Rev. Lett., **81**, 1604 (1998).
[20] H.-W. Lee and J. Kim, Phys. Rev. A, **63**, 012305 (2000).
[21] G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. Lett., **62**, 2124 (1989).
[22] E. Lombardi, F. Sciarrino, S. Popescu, and F. De Martini, Phys. Rev. Lett., **88**, 070402 (2002).
[23] K. J. Resch, J. S. Lundeen, and A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett., **88**, 113601 (2002).
[24] A. I. Lvovsky and J. Mlynek, Phys. Rev. Lett., **88**, 250401 (2002).
[25] S. A. Babichev, J. Ries, and A. I. Lvovsky, Europhys. Lett., **64**, 1 (2003).
[26] S. A. Babichev, B. Brezger, and A. I. Lvovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett., **92**, 047903 (2004).
[27] A. P. Lund and T. C. Ralph, Phys. Rev. A, **66**, 032307 (2002).
[28] L.-A. Wu and D. A. Lidar, J. Math. Phys, **43**, 4506 (2002).
[29] Using the standard bosonic commutation relations one easily derives the identities: $[a_1, a_1^\dagger a_2] = a_2$ and $[a_1^\dagger, a_2^\dagger a_1] = -a_2^\dagger$, and hence $[a_2^\dagger a_1, n_1] = a_2^\dagger a_1$, $[a_1^\dagger a_2, n_1] = -a_1^\dagger a_2$, $[a_1^\dagger a_2, n_2] = a_1^\dagger a_2$, $[a_2^\dagger a_1, n_2] = -a_2^\dagger a_1$, $[a_1^\dagger a_2, a_2^\dagger a_1] = n_1 - n_2$.
[30] It is clear that due to absence of photon-photon interaction the inclusion of additional photons cannot help, so we do not consider this case. In any case a generalization of our proof to the case of 3 or more photons is technically straightforward.
[31] N. Lütkenhaus, J. Calsamiglia, and K.-A. Suominen, Phys. Rev. A, **59**, 3295 (1999).
[32] J. Dunningham and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett., **99**, 180404 (2007).
[33] D. W. Berry and A. I. Lvovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett., **105**, 203601 (2010).